

A Discussion of the Questions Relating to the Passover and Lord's Supper.

BY T. C. EARLY AND L. A. TIME.

PROPOSITIONS.—1. The Paschal Lamb was a type of Christ. 2. The Bible teaches that Christ ate his last supper with his Disciples before the hour or day appointed by the law of Moses for observing the legal Jewish Passover, and expired on the Cross on the day and hour fixed for the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb. 3. The Legal Jewish Passover, modified by Jesus Christ is the proper Lord's Supper for the Christian Church.

My second argument on the second proposition relating to the Passover.

Bro. Time seems to be getting to be in good earnest and I am glad of that, for I want him to do the best he can, but whenever he fails to prove what he says in his favor, he must expect me to meet him, if I think the point has any important bearing on the question. In his last reply he begins with his objection to the phrase, *Legal Jewish Passover*.

It makes but little difference with me which he calls it,—a *lawful* Passover, or a *legal* Jewish Passover. Legal means lawful, and I am not contending for the unlawful, but for the *Legal* Jewish Passover as having been observed by the Jews.

But as he tells us that there was a *Jews'* Passover and not a *Jewish* Passover, I will inform him that the affix-*(ish)* means belonging to, as the word *English* means belonging to England, Spanish means belonging to Spain, foolish means belonging to foolish, childish, belonging to children, *Jewis* belonging to the Jews. Now Paul tells us "to them (the Jews,) were committed the oracles of God;" consequently the Passover belonged to the Jews for practical purposes, therefore, it is right and proper to say *The Legal Jewish Passover*, and I will hold to the proposition as accepted in the beginning. There are, therefore, no important points in the first part of Bro. Time's last argument on this proposition that require consideration, and my first argument on this proposition remains unchanged. I will now proceed to notice the comparison that Time makes of my statement, as compared to Mark 14:12. *I said that the time that Christ ate his last Supper with his disciples was before the time that the Jews ate the legal Jewish Passover.* Bro. Time compares this with Mark which reads, "Now on the first day of the unleavened bread, when the Paschal lambs were sacrificed." And Bro. Time says "Mark has Christ alive yet." Very true at the beginning of the 14th, but not at the close or evening of the 14th of the month, and not on the beginning of the 15th, when the Passover was eaten. For Christ ate his supper on the first evening of the 14th while the Jews ate the Passover meal on the first evening of the 15th, as appointed by the law of Moses. Bro. Time admits that the preparation day was before the Sabbath, or 15th, the day on which the Passover was eaten, now as Mark 15:42 and John 19:31, 32, tell us that Christ expired on the day called the preparation day, it is certain that he ate his last supper before the Jews ate their Passover. And we see that my statement holds good, does not conflict with Mark's gospel, but comes in beautiful harmony with it. When Bro. Time tells you "that I put the *Lie* straight at three of the New Testament evangelist writings" he makes an awful mistake, expressed in rough shod language. But I want you to overlook this in him; he does not mean it so bad. I know him to be a right clever fellow, and I hope a true Christian, but his style of expression is not always "with grace" as Paul admonishes, and you, our readers, must expect us in a controversy to manifest some determination to prove our claims, even at some sacrifice of feeling and respect for each other. We can bear with that to a reasonable extent. Again, Bro. Time says he often wonders why Bible students will persist in misunderstanding the simple language of scripture. In this, we agree, for we both wonder, but the fact is, he made a misapplication of the scripture as compared to my statement.

My argument as last published, being the first argument on the second proposition, remains unshaken.

Christ ate his last supper before the time appointed by the law of Moses for observing the Legal Jewish Passover, and expired on the cross on the day and hour fixed for the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb. This I think I have clearly proved. I will now leave this for your consideration, although I have other evidence yet that might be very appropriately used.

If Bro. Time is ready to enter upon the third proposition, I will be ready at any time.

Second Reply:

We did not mean that our propositions should be personal, nor severe. If there is any offence felt, we humbly beg our dear brother's pardon.

THE LAST PROPOSITION.

The Legal Passover modified by Jesus Christ is the proper Lord's Supper for the Christian Church.

First argument by L. A. Time.

We have now entered upon the weighty part of this inquiry, and it has become of such importance that double diligence should be given to the further inquiry in the subject. In this investigation the ground that has already been covered by the inquiry must be examined again. At the onset we deemed it wise to state the different heads of the proposed inquiry, and draw a line of demarkation between what is actual fact and what is conjecture, that shall come up for investigation. The facts are substantially these:

1. Christ ate a supper on the night of his betrayal.
 2. The Apostles call the supper that Christ ate the Passover.
 3. This passover was eaten on the night following the first of unleavened bread, or the beginning of the fifteenth day.
 4. Christ was anointed High Priest before this supper was held, and became the final Law-giver.
 5. The Temple of Jerusalem was made desolate before the Holy Supper took place.
 6. A change in the priesthood made a change in the law necessary.
 7. "Passover" was universally used by the Apostolic and Primitive church to designate the great annual solemnity, commemorating the death, suffering and resurrection of Jesus Christ.
- CONJECTURE.—a. Christ ate lamb and unleavened bread in his last passover or supper.
- b. Christ did not eat lamb and unleavened bread in his last supper.
- c. The love feast was a representative festival, kept with leavened bread.
- d. The Lord's Supper was an annual observance.
- e. Christ was not acting under the law of Moses when he ate his last passover.

In this inquiry types and antitypes will be ignored. They are of no benefit whatever in interpreting the word of God. To be candid, this talk about types and antitypes is confusing nonsense and renders no assistance in coming to a knowledge of truth. If there were certain things under Moses which were shadows of things to come, what advantage is gained in practical effect by examining a shadow when the thing that created it is in your presence. There is pleasant pastime often in comparing the likeness of a man to the man, but there is no practical good that can result. As much is true of shadow theology.

This inquiry is not to sustain any dogma, but is an earnest inquiry after doctrine on the question of the Lord's Supper. It is not a discussion for the purpose of gaining a point against an opponent.

The first important point to settle is, whether there is a difference between the three evangelists and St. John regarding the last events of Jesus' life.

The primitive theologians simply differed. The Schoolmen or medieval made Matthew, Mark and Luke liars. Modern theologians of great erudition assert that there is a difference, which can not be reconciled.

Others take the ground that there is no difference between Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Luke declares that he "had perfect understanding of all things from the very first." If the Schoolmen's interpretation of John's language is correct, then Luke told an awful whopper.

We take the ground that there is no difference between John and the other three synoptists; that the difference that men have found consists in the meaning they attach to a few phrases. If an agreement can be reached on—several or all the points of difference, this inquiry will be more satisfactory to both of us. Will you please give in your answer your views upon these points?

1. Did Christ rise from the dead on the 1st day of the week?
2. Was he in the tomb on Saturday or the Sabbath?
3. Was he crucified on Friday?
4. What was the "preparation" and what was the character of that observance?
5. Was it a moveable or fixed observance of the Passover week?

6. What day of the week did the 1st day of unleavened bread come upon, in the year that Christ was crucified?

I will close here and await your brotherly reply to these inquiries. The divisions given at the head of this article will give you an idea of the ground we expect to go over in the investigation.

NOTE.

I notice a brother propounds several questions, as follows:

It is also a question in the mind of some by what law of logic "Time" arrives at the conclusion that Christ was crucified after the time of celebrating the passover, according to the law when the following facts appeared in the sacred record:

- 1st. The Lamb was invariably slain on the 14th day of the month at even. Ex. 12:6.
 - 2nd. It was roasted and eaten during the night that followed or in the beginning of the 15th.
 - 3rd. The 15th day of the month or the day that followed the slaying of the Lamb was the Sabbath. Ex. 12:16.
- This being the case how could Christ have been crucified after the legal passover hour, when he was dead and entombed the day before the Sabbath, the preparation day? See Math. 27:61, 62.

We can see no difficulty whatever in this.

Q. On what day of the week was the 14th, in the year that Christ was crucified?

A. On Thursday.

Q. When did Christ eat his supper or passover?

A. After sunset on the 14th.

Q. Was the 15th day called the Sabbath?

A. No, it was not. On that day there was a holy convocation, and no servile work, outside of preparing to eat and eating was to be performed. It was a day for holy meetings and feasting.

Q. What was the preparation which is mentioned in the gospels?

A. That was the day before the Sabbath of the Ten commandments.

In the year of the crucifixion, it happened on Friday. The 14th day, or 1st day of unleavened bread came upon all days of the week in different years. When the 14th came on Tuesday, then the preparation would be on Friday, then there was Wednesday and Thursday between the 14th and the preparation. The preparation was always on Friday, while the 14th sometimes was on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, etc. From no time to five days intervened between the passover meal and the preparation.

"Preparation of the Passover," means the preparation or the day before the Sabbath that came in the seven days of the feast. In St. John's time of writing, the term Paschal was applied to the whole solemnity.

Locked In.

President Lincoln was greatly aided in the discharge of his trying duties by preserving a cheerful spirit. Others who came in contact with him often caught the same spirit. In his early practice as a lawyer, two western farmers, who were in a fearful quarrel over the division of a portion of their land, happened to meet at his office, as both had come to retain him as their lawyer. He labored long and earnestly with them, urging them to settle their differences at home, before a deadly and life-long feud was engendered. The three were in Lincoln's little office in an upper room where the heat was intense. At noon he begged them to excuse him a little while, and while he was absent he hoped they would alone talk over and settle their differences. As the kind-hearted lawyer went out, he turned the key and locked them in. This stroke of policy was so humorous that both the farmers began to laugh, and soon they were in a mood to talk reasonably; and when in the middle of the afternoon Lincoln returned, they only wished him to draw up articles of agreement.

Died.

At her home in Lake Township, Berrien Co., Mich., on June 13, 1888, Mrs. Martha Falkner Voorhees, wife of Eld. Isaac Voorhees aged 50 years and 10 days.

Mrs. Voorhees had been sick for more than a year and for the last eight months she was confined to her bed. Her husband and children did all that could be done by way of securing medical aid, and by personal attention for her recovery. Her illness was of such a character as to be beyond the reach of human skill to remove it. But amid all her suffering Christ was her comforter, and his grace her support. The writer visited her often during her illness, read the Word of life to her and prayed with her. She expressed perfect reconciliation to the will of God and was "ready to depart and be with Christ."

Special mention should be made here of the fact that the church to which Mrs. Voorhees belonged came to the help of this afflicted family just as all churches should do under such circumstances. "I was sick and ye visited me." "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto these ye have done it unto me."

The funeral service were held at the Brethren church in New Troy, being conducted by the undersigned who preached from the words of Christ found in John's Gospel, 17:24. "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am."

J. J. BUNNELL.

Pastor Congregational church, Bridgeman, Mich.

It may seem a small matter for a person to be a few minutes late at a Sunday morning church service; but when a person, or a family, is in the habit of being late in this way, it is fair to accept the fact as an indication of character. Thus a young man was recently characterized in the expressive suggestion: "He comes of a family that is always late at church." That would be a poor subject for family pride—a reputation of that sort!—S. S. Times.